

### REMARKS

The foregoing amendment does not include the introduction of new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicant, respectfully, requests that the above amendment be entered in and that the claims to the present application, kindly, be reconsidered.

The Office Action dated August 16, 2004 has been received and considered by the Applicants. Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application for invention. Claims 1-11 stand rejected and Claims 2, 8, 10, and 11 are objected to by the August 16, 2004 Office Action.

The Office Action objects to Claims 2, 8, 10, and 11 under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The Examiner further states that Claims 2 and 8 fail to further limit the claim from which they depend. The foregoing amendment to the claims has corrected this oversight by tailoring Claim 2 and 8 to define that the peer interface of the master has the ability to address the interface of the linked devices. The Applicant, respectfully, points out that this amendment, while tailoring and more clearly defining the invention also has a broadening effect. The broadening effect stems from removing the definition of the interface of the linked devices as being a peer interface module and preventing an interpretation of the interface modules as being embedded web servers.

The Examiner further states that Claim 10 fails to further limit Claim 7 as the limitation of "said master control device...to at least one camera" is also present in Claim 7. The foregoing amendment to the claims has corrected this oversight by clearly identifying that the master has access to each camera of said linked devices. Claim 11 is objected to due to its dependence on Claim 10 which is believed to have been obviated by the amendment to Claim 10.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-11 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,155,840 issued to Sallette (hereinafter referred to as Sallette). The Examiner states that Sallette discloses a peer distributed, embedded web server system accessing and controlling a multiplicity of devices as defined by rejected Claim 1, comprising: a master control device comprising an embedded web server, peer interface module, and host software; a plurality of linked devices that

communicate with, and that are controlled by, said embedded web server of said master control device.

The Applicant, respectfully, points out that the rejection states that column 4, lines 52-54 of Sallette teach an embedded web server. Column 4, lines 52-54 of Sallette teach that distributed learning servers (DSL) 102 acts as a server for distributed learning system 100. The examiner then asserts that column 5, lines 11-18 of Sallette teach that a plurality of linked devices is controlled by the embedded web server. The embedded server as previously discussed, is DSL 102. Column 5, lines 11-18 of Sallette teach that audience member computer systems may be linked but there is no teaching or suggestion that the audience member computer systems can be controlled by the presenter embedded web server (DSL 102). Sallette teach that each audience member computer systems may be linked to embedded web server (DSL 102) in manner similar to the presenter.

The Examiner further states that Sallette at column 7, lines 35-49 teaches providing the master with a user operated web browser to access said plurality of linked devices. The Applicants would like to, respectfully, point out that column 7, lines 35-49 of Sallette clearly demonstrate that the presenter computer system and the audience computer systems are equally in control of themselves. Specifically, each the presenter computer system and the audience computer systems contain web browser capabilities. Neither the presenter computer system nor the audience computer systems has control over the other. There is no teaching or suggestion within Sallette that the audience member computer systems can be controlled by the embedded web server (DSL 102) of the presenter. In fact the audience computer systems have equal access and control to the DSL 102 servers.

The Applicant respectfully points out that column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 31 of Sallette teaches that the presenter system can control the information that appears on the audience systems. The Applicant, respectfully, asserts that control of the information that appears on a system is not equivalent to control of the system.

Accordingly, in an effort to move this case towards allowance, Claim 1 has been amended to clearly illustrate that the master is in control of the linked devices and that access to the embedded web server is controlled by the master peer interface. The Applicant respectfully submits the Claim 1 as amended is clearly distinguishable from the

teachings of Sallette.

The Examiner making the rejection with regard to Claim 2 states that Sallette teaches that the peer distributed embedded web server system can access and control a multiplicity of devices. As previously discussed, Sallette does not disclose or suggest master control access of the audience computer systems by an embedded web within the presenter computer systems within Sallette. Sallette teaches a presentation system wherein each of the audience systems can access DSL 102. Therefore, Claim 2 is believed to be allowable.

The Examiner making the rejection with regard to Claim 3 states Sallette teaches a peer distributed, embedded web server system for accessing and controlling a multiplicity of devices in accordance, wherein said master control device and said plurality of linked devices each comprises a device from the group of digital video recorder, digital video encoder, and network camera. The Applicants would like to, respectfully, disagree. Claim 3 defines subject matter "wherein said master control device and said plurality of linked devices each comprises a device from the group of digital video recorder, digital video encoder, and network camera." Sallette does not teach or suggest the audience system having either of a digital video recorder, digital video encoder, and network camera. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner making the rejection with regard to Claim 4 states that Sallette teaches the peer distributed, embedded web server system for accessing and controlling a multiplicity of devices, wherein each of said plurality of linked devices has a digital video recorder operatively connected to at least one camera. As previously discussed, Sallette does not teach or suggest the audience system having digital video recorder operatively connected to at least one camera. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner making the rejection with regard to Claim 5 states that Sallette teaches a peer distributed, embedded web server system for accessing and controlling a multiplicity of devices, wherein said master control device and said linked devices are each operatively connected to at least one camera. Sallette does not teach or suggest the audience system operatively connected to at least one camera. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner making the rejection with regard to Claim 6 states that Sallette teaches a peer distributed, embedded web server system for accessing and controlling a multiplicity of devices in accordance with Claim 5, wherein said web browser provides HTTP commands to

said master control device for receiving a video stream from at least one of said predetermined EWS devices in said EWS system. The Applicant, respectfully, submits that the foregoing amendment to Claim 1 obviates this rejection.

The Examiner making the rejection with regard to Claim 7 states Sallette discloses a peer distributed, embedded web server system accessing and controlling a multiplicity of devices comprising: a master control device comprising an embedded web server, peer interface module, and host software; a plurality of linked devices that communicate with, and that are controlled by, said embedded web server of said master control device. The Applicant, respectfully, points that column 4, lines 52-54 of Sallette teach an embedded web server. Column 4, lines 52-54 of Sallette teach that distributed learning servers (DSL) 102 acts as a server for distributed learning system 100. The examiner then asserts that column 5, lines 11-18 of Sallette teach that a plurality of linked devices is controlled by the embedded web server. The embedded server as previously discussed, is DSL 102. Column 5, lines 11-18 of Sallette teach that audience member computer systems may be linked but there is no teaching or suggestion that the audience member computer systems can be controlled by the presenter. Sallette teach that audience member computer systems may be linked to embedded web server (DSL 102) in manner similar to the presenter.

The Examiner further states that column 7, lines 35-49 of Sallette teach providing the master with a user operated web browser to access said plurality of linked devices. The Applicants would like to, respectfully, point out that neither the presenter computer system nor the audience computer systems has control over the other. In fact the audience computer systems have equal access and control to the DSL 102 servers.

The Applicant respectfully points out that column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 31 of Sallette teaches that the presenter system can control the information that appears on the audience systems. The Applicant, respectfully, asserts that control of the information that appears on a system is not equivalent to control of the system.

In an effort to move this case towards allowance, Claim 7 has been amended to clearly illustrate that the master is in control of the linked devices and that access to the embedded web server is controlled by the master peer interface. The Applicant respectfully submits the Claim 7 as amended is clearly distinguishable from the teachings of Sallette.

The Examiner making the rejection with regard to Claim 8 states that the embedded web server system for accessing and controlling a multiplicity of devices in accordance with Claim 7, wherein said plurality of linked devices each comprises peer interface means for communicating with the peer interface means of said master control device. As previously stated, there is no master controlled access for the embedded web server of the audience computer systems by the presenter computer systems within Sallette. Therefore, Claim 8 is believed to be allowable.

The Examiner making the rejection with regard to Claim 9 states that the embedded web server system for accessing and controlling a multiplicity of devices in accordance with Claim 7, wherein said master control device and said plurality of linked devices each comprise a digital video recorder. The Applicants would like to, respectfully, disagree. Claim 9 defines subject matter "wherein said master control device and said plurality of linked devices each comprises a device from the group of digital video recorder, digital video encoder, and network camera." Sallette does not teach or suggest the audience system having either digital video recorder, digital video encoder, and network camera. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner making the rejection with regard to Claim 10 states that the embedded web server system for accessing and controlling a multiplicity of devices in accordance with Claim 7, wherein said master control device and said linked devices are each operatively connected to at least one camera. Sallette does not teach or suggest the audience system having digital video recorder operatively connected to at least one camera. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner making the rejection with regard to Claim 11 states that the embedded web server system for accessing and controlling a multiplicity of devices in accordance with Claim 10, wherein said web browser provides HTTP commands to said master control device for receiving a video stream from at least one of said predetermined devices in said EWS system. The Applicant, respectfully, submits that the foregoing amendment to Claim 1 obviates this rejection.

The foregoing amendment has added new Claims 12-20. New Claim 12-17 are generally of similar to original Claims 1-11 are therefore, believed to be allowable for the above stated reasons for Claim 1-11.

Claims 18-20 define subject matter for a viewer within web browser that allows each of

said linked devices to be viewed by said master control device, a web page within said web browser allows incorporation at least one additional of said linked devices into the distributed server system, and wherein said web page provides address entry of at least one additional of the linked devices and incorporation of at least one additional of the linked into the viewer. This subjected matter is describe on pages 7 and 8 of the specification to the present invention, therefore does not attempt to add new matter into the present application for invention. The cited prior art does not disclose or suggest the subject matter defined by Claims 18-20. Therefore, Claims 18-20 are believed to be allowable.

Applicant is not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James D. Leimbach  
Patent Attorney, Reg. No. 34,374

**Please address all correspondence  
for this case to:**

Michael E. Belk  
Senior Intellectual Property Counsel  
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards  
Philips Electronics N.A. Corp.  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001 USA  
914-333-9643

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence  
is being transmitted on this date via  
facsimile transmission to (703) 872-9306 AND addressed to:  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Transmission: November 17, 2004

Signature: 

Person Signing: James D. Leimbach